### **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P. O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600



PHONE (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221

### "PUBLIC NOTICE OF MEETING"

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., notice is hereby given to the public that the following meetings will be held

THE WEEK OF JULY 15 - 19, 2013

**MONDAY, JULY 15, 2013** 

\*3:00 p.m. Housing Authority

Room 604, City Hall 100 N. Jefferson Street

**TUESDAY, JULY 16, 2013** 

(No Meetings)

WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2013

\*7:00 p.m. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Legislative Room 203 100 N. Jefferson Street

**THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2013** 

\*5:15 p.m. Brown County Library Board

Central Library 515 Pine Street

FRIDAY, JULY 19, 2013

(No Meetings)

### **AGENDA**

### **BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY**

Monday, July 15, 2013, 3:00 p.m. City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604 Green Bay, WI 54301

**MEMBERS:** Tom Diedrick-Chair, Ann Hartman, Sup. Andy Nicholson, Corday Goddard, vacant position

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

1. Approval of the minutes from the June 17, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority

### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

### **REPORTS:**

- 2. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
  - A. Preliminary Applications
  - B. Unit Count
  - C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses
  - D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
  - E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)
  - F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, escrow accounts, graduates, new contracts, homeownership)
  - G. VASH Reports (active VASH, new VASH)
  - H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations
  - I. Reasons for Background Screening Denials
  - J. Breakdown of HCV households by Green Bay Neighborhood Associations

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

None

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

3. Discussion and possible action regarding status of Housing Choice Voucher Program

#### **INFORMATIONAL:**

4. Exception granted for Conversion Loan Program

**BILLS:** 

**FINANCIAL REPORT:** 

STAFF REPORT:

Any person wishing to attend who, because of a disability, requires special accommodation should contact the Brown County Human Resources Office at 448-4065 by 4:30 p.m. on the day before the meeting so that arrangements can be made.

### **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**





305 E. WALNUT STREET P. O. BOX 23600

GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600

PHONE (920) 448-4013 FAX (920) 448-6221

E-mail <u>BrownCountyCountyBoard@co.brown.wi.us.</u>

PATRICK W. MOYNIHAN JR., CHAIR
THOMAS J. LUND, VICE CHAIR

### **PUBLIC NOTICE OF MEETING**

Pursuant to Section 19.85 and 59.094, <u>Wis. Stats</u>, notice is hereby given to the public that the regular meeting of the **BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS** will be held on <u>Wednesday</u>, <u>July 17</u>, <u>2013 at 7:00</u> <u>p.m.</u>, in the Legislative Room 203, 100 North Jefferson St., Green Bay, Wisconsin.

The following matters will be considered:

Call to order.

Invocation.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Opening Roll Call.

- 1. Adoption of Agenda.
- 2. Comments from the Public:
  - a) Must be limited to items not on the agenda.
  - b) State name and address for the record.
  - c) Comments will be limited to five minutes.
  - d) The Board's role is to listen and not discuss comments nor take action of those comments at this meeting.
- 3. Approval of Minutes of June 19, 2013
- 4. Announcements of Supervisors.
- 5. Communications: (None)
  - a) Late Communications.
- 6. **Appointments:**

### **County Executive**

- a) Appointment of Jeremy Kral as the Executive Director of Brown County Human Services.
- b) Appointment of Paul Gazdik as the Emergency Management Director.
- c) Appointment of Adam De Keyser to the Housing Authority for the remainder of a five (5) year term expiring April 30, 2015.
- 7. Reports by:
  - a) County Executive.
  - b) Board Chairman.
- 8. Other Reports:
  - a) None

### 9. Standing Committee Reports:

- a) Report of Administration Committee of June 27, 2013.
- b) Report of Education & Recreation Committee of July 1, 2013.
- c) Report of Executive Committee of July 8, 2013.
- d) Report of Human Services Committee of June 26, 2013.
- e) Report of Planning, Development & Transportation Committee of June 24, 2013.
  - i) Report of Land Conservation Subcommittee of June 24, 2013.
- f) Report of Public Safety Committee of June 26, 2013.

### 10. Resolutions, Ordinances:

### **Education and Recreation Committee**

a) Resolution to Approve a Consent to Easement for a Non-Exclusive Underground Electrical Line Easement Between the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and Wisconsin Public Service Corporation. *Motion at Ed and Rec: To approve*.

### <u>Planning, Development and Transportation Committee and Executive Committee:</u>

b) Resolution Regarding Reorganization of the Port and Solid Waste Department. *Motion at PD&T: To approve; Motion at Exec: To approve.* 

### **Public Safety Committee and Executive Committee:**

- c) Resolution Regarding Change in Table of Organization Public Safety Communications
  Assistant Director of Public Safety Communications. Motion at Public Safety: To approve;
  Motion at Exec: To approve.
- 11. Closed Session: None.
- 12. Such other matters as authorized by law.
- 13. Bills over \$5,000 for period ending June 30, 2013.
- 14. Closing Roll Call.
- 15. Adjournment to <u>Wednesday, July 31, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.</u>, Legislative Room, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin for Grievance Session.

Submitted by:

Patrick W. Moynihan, Jr.

**Board Chairman** 

Notice is hereby given that action by the County Board of Supervisors may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda. The County Board of Supervisors may go into <u>Closed Session</u>: Pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 19.85(1)(e) to deliberate or negotiate the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session.

## Brown County

515 PINE STREET GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54301-5194

(920) 448-4364

PHONE (920) 448-4400

LYNN M. STAINBROOK

DIRECTO

E-MAIL Stainbrook\_LM@co.brown.wi.us WEBSITE www.browncountylibrary.org

"Providing trusted information and resources to connect people, ideas and community."

### **BROWN COUNTY LIBRARY BOARD**

Central Library
515 Pine Street, downtown Green Bay
Thursday, July 18, 2013
5:15 p.m.
AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Consent Items (5 minutes)
  - a. Approve/modify agenda
  - b. Approval of minutes
- 3. Communications and Open Forum for the Public (5 minutes)
- 4. Report from Museum-Library Taskforce (5 minutes)
- 5. Strategic Planning Discussion (30 minutes)
- 6. Library Business (30 minutes)
  - a. Information Services Report
  - b. Financial Manager's report, bills and donations
  - c. Approve Budget Adjustment Notice: Transfer budget funds from Software to Outlay Other
  - d. Approve Budget Adjustment Notice: Reallocate funds back to Vehicle/Equip. Gas/Oil Etc. account based on prior year actuals
  - e. 2014 Budget
  - f. Facilities report
    - 1. Progress Report on Cellcom Children's Vegetable Garden
    - 2. Library Locations
    - 3. Update on various projects
- 7. Nicolet Federated Library System (5 minutes)
  - a. Monthly update
- 8. Old Business (5 minutes)
- 9. Personnel
  - a. Approve Table of Organization Change for Administration Clerk Mailroom
  - b. Impact of Affordable Care Act

- 10. President's Report (5 minutes)
- 11. Director's Report questions/clarifications (5 minutes)
- 12. Such Other Matters as are Authorized by Law (5 minutes)
- 13. Meeting Summary/Next Meeting Planning (5 minutes)
- 14. Adjournment

Notice is hereby given that action by the committee may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda.

> Kathy L. Pletcher President

Losthy L. Pletcher

Next Meeting: Thursday, August 15, 2013 Ashwaubenon Branch Library 1060 Orlando Drive 5:15 p.m.

SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
	1 Ed & Rec 5:30 p.m.	2	3  Public Safety 5:30 pm See June 26th	County Board Office Closed	5	6
7	8 Executive Cmte 5:30 pm	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	Vet's Recognition 5:00 pm	Board of Supervisors 7:00 pm	18	19	20
21	Land Con 6 pm PD&T 6:15 pm	23	24 Human Svc 6:00 pm	25 Admin 5:00 pm	26	27
28	29	30	31 Special Board of Sup Grievance Hearing			

### AUGUST 2013



SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7 Public Safety 5:30 pm	8	9	10
11	Executive Cmte 5:30 pm	13	14	Ed & Rec 5:30 p.m.	16	17
18	19	Veterans Recognition Subcommittee 5:00	Board of Supervisors 7:00 pm	Admin 5:00 pm	23	24
25	26 Land Con 6:00 pm PD&T 6:15 pm	27	28 Human Svc 6:00 pm	Special Board of Sup Grievance Hearing	30	31

### **BROWN COUNTY COMMITTEE MINUTES**

- Brown County Housing Authority (June 17, 2013)
- Aging & Disability Resource Center Executive/ Finance Committee (June 27, 2013)

### To obtain a copy of Committee minutes:

http://www.co.brown.wi.us/minutes\_and\_agendas/

OR

Contact the Brown County Board Office or the County Clerk's Department

# MINUTES BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY Monday, June 17, 2013, 3:00 p.m. City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604 Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Diedrick-Chair, Ann Hartman, Sup. Andy Nicholson

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Corday Goddard

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Rob Strong, Robyn Hallet, Stephanie Schmutzer, Ben Fauske, Matt Roberts. Pat Leifker. Robert Hornacek (WLUK - Fox 11)

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

1. Approval of the minutes from the May 20, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of the minutes from the May 20, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

2. Letter from Housing Authority Insurance Group regarding dividends received

R. Hallet reported that the letter from the Housing Authority Insurance Group is regarding dividends that the BCHA has received in two checks, one for \$167.51 and the other for \$530.90.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to receive and place on file the letter from Housing Authority Insurance Group. Motion carried.

### **REPORTS:**

- 3. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
  - A. Preliminary Applications
    - P. Leifker reported that there were 77 preliminary applications for May 2013.
  - B. Unit Count
    - P. Leifker reported that the unit count for May 2013 was 3,062 units.
  - C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses
    P. Leifker reported that the Housing Assistance Payments for May 2013 was \$1,216,175.00.
  - D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
     M. Roberts reported that there were 320 inspections in May 2013, and of those 54.38% passed their first inspection, 23.12% passed the reevaluation, and 22.5% failed.
  - E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)
    P. Leifker reported that for May 2013 there were 275 port-out units and 23 port-in units.
    The total administrative funding received from HUD was \$99,213.00, and the administrative expense was \$103,541.48. The administrative overspent difference was \$7.900.15.

- F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, escrow accounts, graduates, new contracts, homeownership)
  - P. Leifker reported that there were 96 FSS clients in May 2013, 34 escrow accounts, no graduates, 3 new contracts, and 69 homeowners.
- G. VASH Reports (active VASH, new VASH)
  P. Leifker reported that there were 19 VASH clients and 2 new VASH clients for May 2013.
- H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations
  P. Leifker reported that there were 3 new investigations assigned, 2 new investigations
  closed, 2 previous investigations closed, and 2 investigations still active.
  - P. Leifker also added that 5 out of the 6 fraud investigations were in Green Bay, and 1 was in Ashwaubenon.
- I. Reasons for Background Screening Denials
  - P. Leifker reported that there were no background checks because there have been no current lease-ups.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

None

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- Discussion and possible action to approve use of reserve funding due to federal funding cuts
  - R. Hallet stated that with sequestration, the BCHA's administrative fees are currently at 69%. With this significant decrease, BCHA staff is working with ICS in finding ways to reduce costs. A current issue that we are dealing with is increasing the voucher utilization; we want to administer as many vouchers as possible, which increases administrative fees and secures funding for next year. However, ICS staff is at its capacity with workload and do not have time to issue additional vouchers without hiring more staff. ICS has not refilled various vacated staff positions.
  - B. Fauske stated that with sequestration, ICS has suspended new lease-ups and hiring additional staff to keep costs as low as possible. The voucher issuance situation was discussed with a HUD representative, who recommended that BCHA begin issuing vouchers and utilize the BCHA's reserve funds. The BCHA's reserves are larger than the national average in both the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) funds and the Administrative funds. If BCHA does not utilize their reserves funds, eventually the funds could be lost to the federal government. HUD also recommended ICS continue leasing up new clients because they have the funds available to do so. Also ICS has found that their client specialists are handling higher caseloads than they should be. With work overload, this jeopardizes high performance status along with clientele services. He requested use of the reserves funds to lease-up new clients and bring on new staff. He reported that they are short two positions.
  - B. Fauske further reported that HUD highly recommends Housing Authorities to have one month of funding in reserves, but BCHA has over 6 months in reserves for their administrative fees. BCHA is recommended to use their reserve funds, or they could lose them the following year. If BCHA decides to spend its reserves, then the HAP reserves

would decrease to about \$1.6 million. BCHA's target is to administer about 3,150 vouchers, and this will take about \$38,000 from the Administrative funds.

A. Hartman questioned if the federal government will take the reserves funds regardless of how well BCHA has administered the Housing Choice Voucher Program. B. Fauske replied it will be taken away if the BCHA does not utilize it.

A. Nicholson asked why BCHA would want to increase the voucher usage. A. Hartman responded that increasing the voucher usage would increase the amount of funding for next year. A. Nicholson inquired if the BCHA needs more funding.

B. Fauske explained that the long waiting list demonstrates there is a need for housing assistance, and the BCHA thus needs to increase the voucher usage.

A. Nicolson inquired if the federal government will take the waiting list along with the funding. B. Fauske responded no; we would just have to serve fewer clients, and the size of the waiting list would only increase.

A. Nicholson questioned how many people are on the waiting list. P. Leifker replied that the waiting list is currently 500-600 families.

A. Hartman inquired if all the people on the waiting list are Brown County residents. P. Leifker explained the waiting list is broken into preferences based on Brown County residency, which the 500-600 families does not include non-residents since they haven't pulled off of that waiting list for over 10 years.

A. Nicholson questioned why the waiting list number does not include the non-residents. P. Leifker replied that non-residents are in fact counted but are not included in the above count of 500-600. This is because BCHA targets families of Brown County residency before helping families outside of Brown County. He explained that the 500-600 people on the waiting list only refers to people of Brown County, and adding the non-Brown County applicants to the count would make the number larger.

B. Fauske stated that BCHA's goal is to transition families to self sufficiency by helping them become educated and find work, and the 3,000+ families receiving vouchers rotates to new families who need help.

A. Nicholson inquired where the families on the waiting list are living now while they're waiting. P. Leifker and M. Roberts responded that not all of them are homeless and could be in a variety of situations, for example living with friends, going through a divorce, paying their rent but not being able to pay their other bills, living in substandard housing, etc.

R. Strong stated that the reserves are funds that have to be used for Housing Assistance Payments; they cannot be used for anything else. Furthermore, although HUD recommends holding one month's reserve, he personally recommended we keep it a bit higher. B. Fauske interjected that \$1.2 million would be a one-month reserve, but we want to bring it down to \$1.6 million.

A. Nicolson restated for clarity that the idea is to use the reserves to help the BCHA through the end of the year, so we can get more HUD funding the following year. B. Fauske confirmed this is accurate and further explained that having qualified people on the waiting list will justify the increase in voucher utilization.

A. Nicholson questioned if all 600 people on the waiting list are qualified for vouchers. R. Hallet responded that the applications are only preliminary, and ICS does not determine qualification until the application reaches the top of the waiting list. B. Fauske added that approximately 25-50% will not qualify or don't follow through for the assistance.

A. Nicholson inquired if the reserves funds are only used for Administrative fees. B. Fauske explained that there are two funds: one is the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) fund which is only used to pay landlords on clients' behalf and currently is roughly \$2.6 million. For example, to lease-up an additional 200 people, ICS would have to come up with the money to pay the landlords because sequestration has reduced the HAP funds that we receive. We would therefore have to pull from the reserves to pay for these new clients. In this way, next year when HUD determines funding, it is based on the total number of vouchers we pay monthly this year.

A. Nicholson questioned what would happen next year if BCHA does not receive funding. B. Fauske replied that we'd be in the same situation in which ICS will have to continue to suspend leasing up vouchers, which would cause the waiting list to grow. A. Nicholson inquired if the waiting list could go somewhere else. A. Hartman stated that no other Housing Authority is accepting applicants to be on their wait list. She stated that BCHA is the only Housing Authority that has an open waitlist in comparison to Chicago and Minneapolis where they are no longer accepting applications. Since BCHA is still accepting people on the waiting list, people are coming here to get a voucher. R. Hallet interjected that some people are coming here to get a voucher; some housing authorities have closed waiting lists. A. Nicholson expressed his opinion that "some" is quite a bit. R. Hallet stated there are also a lot of people who live here who need a voucher, to which A. Nicholson disagreed.

T. Diedrick stated that the percentage of assisted families moving out of Brown County is very low. He explained that when you look at the number of port-outs compared to the total number of vouchers leased every month, it's a low percentage.

A. Nicholson stated that it would be interesting to know the percentage of people coming into the county that say they are county residents who are applying for vouchers. Staff responded that there is no way of knowing that. R. Strong mentioned that the BCHA sent out a survey two to three years ago that inquired about this kind of information. R. Hallet explained that the results of the survey showed that the majority of people applying for the Housing Choice Voucher Program are indeed what many would consider to be residents of Brown County. A. Nicholson expressed that we just said that there's no way of knowing this information but now we're saying this is known. R. Hallet reiterated that the survey was from three years ago; this information is not known for the applicants currently on the waiting list. A. Nicholson clarified that he wants to know how many people are coming in from surrounding areas that are establishing themselves as Brown County residents.

P. Leifker explained that when someone applies, they need to indicate if they are a resident or not. If they claim that they are, they need to provide a proper ID, as well as two pieces of documentation confirming their local address, and they are thus considered a Brown County resident. Applicants who are non-Brown County residents are placed on the non-preference list. A. Nicholson reiterated that he knows this but what he is asking is how many are coming from outside of the area to get on our program, and he thinks we should know this information.

B. Fauske stated that currently the port-out percentage is 9%; 91% of voucher holders are staying here. M. Roberts explained that while we don't have data to directly answer

A. Nicholson's question, other information about the waiting list is telling. He went on to explain that within the preference category there are sub-preferences of 1) displaced families and then 2) the elderly, disabled, and veterans. With the suspension of leasing up new vouchers, the numbers in these subcategories continue to rise. When we begin issuing vouchers, we will follow this order and issue vouchers first to these categories, which are generally not populations that tend to port-out. M. Roberts offered to email Commissioners the breakdown of the number of applicants in each subcategory.

- R. Strong stated that the issue with port-out has been discussed at the last meeting with a representative from Reed Ribble's office. Some other Housing Authorities are not dealing with the same problem because they are not accepting applications or don't have enough funding to serve additional clients from the waiting list. He said it was made clear to Reed Ribble's representative that they need to take a look at some of the regulatory changes BCHA has suggested in the past.
- B. Fauske stated that the representative from Reed Ribble's office has contacted him about some information. He responded quickly, and she is talking to a Washington representative about the issue. R. Strong added that information was sent out several years ago and yielded no results, so now maybe Reed Ribble will take this on.
- B. Fauske asked A. Nicholson for clarification if his concern is that by issuing more vouchers, the number of port-outs will only increase. A. Nicholson agreed that is his concern. B. Fauske agreed this is a major concern. R. Strong added that there are local residents on the waiting list as well, but with the rules in place, we cannot restrict people from porting out so there's not an easy way around this.

During the meeting, R. Hallet found and reported on the results of the survey of applicants conducted several years ago: 88% of applicants resided in Brown County; of those, 37% lived in Brown County for 10 or more years, 8% lived here 6-9 years, 14% lived here 1-5 years, and 32% lived here less than 1 year. R. Hallet expressed that the greatest concern may be regarding the 32% who've lived in Brown County less than a year, but it is positive to see that 37% resided in Brown County for 10 or more years and furthermore 59% reported living here for over a year, 45% for over 5 years. R. Strong pointed out another important factor is that 25% lived in Brown County, moved away, and have now moved back. R. Strong stated that BCHA is not aware of the reasons why people move out of Brown County and then come back to Brown County. R. Hallet reported that the survey results indicate a main criteria for moving to Brown County is because of friends, family, and employment in the area. R. Strong stated that the surveys were voluntary and optional.

- T. Diedrick stated that the big issue is that HUD reviews the count of money and vouchers used, and this determines the budget for the following year. M. Roberts confirmed this is correct: HUD looks at the count for January through September to determine the following year's funding, so lease-ups during this time period is of the utmost importance. M. Roberts indicated that they have briefing packets made, calendars ready to schedule appointments; they just need the manpower to do it.
- T. Diedrick inquired if new staff to ICS will be temporary employees. B. Fauske replied that they considered this but don't think that would be the best strategy due to the learning curve for the position and staff turnover from time to time. He also added that in talking to HUD, they are encouraging BCHA/ICS to make use of the reserves.
- T. Diedrick summarized that the options are to use the reserves or do nothing and risk the possibility of losing some of the reserves. R. Strong added that utilizing the reserves fund is

not sustainable, but BCHA needs to bring the reserves numbers down. He expressed that it's unfortunate that they can't do more to ensure it is true Brown County residents that would receive the vouchers, but we have stretched those rules to the limit. He reiterated, as the survey showed, that the majority of applicants are from Brown County, so it would be wrong to deny serving them. T. Diedrick also expressed that he is concerned about those who are residents, so we really need to think about using the reserves and risk having some port-outs with that.

A. Hartman stated that she is concerned with using the reserves funds because it risks the funding for the following year. If we don't get enough funding next year to support the additional people we've leased up, would we have to terminate some people from the program? She inquired about why HUD would provide additional funding next year if we use reserves this year. B. Fauske replied that HUD will set funding nationally. Further, with the current sequestration, this is hopefully the lowest the funding will be; we're assuming in the future it will be at this level or more. If we use some of the reserves annually, it will still last 20 or more years. He reiterated that HUD states our reserves are higher than they typically see and recommends that we put these funds to work to help improve the program. The goal is not to have a high savings account; it is to help the folks who need it. He emphasized that the reserves are designed to be used in these very times when federal funding is low due to sequestration.

R. Strong stated that having a month's reserves is safest in case HUD would be late in distributing their funds. We can still make payments to the landlords who are expecting their checks. He expressed that he is just as concerned about HUD funding the vouchers as he is about not having enough funds to administer the program – to have enough manpower to keep the program running. When ICS prepares a budget for next year, BCHA will focus on what is sustainable over time with using the reserves funds for the future. BCHA will also be looking at what ICS will do to improve the program and make it more customer friendly, which is also a good use of the reserves. B. Fauske agreed that those are the two main reasons for the reserves: emergency situations like now and special projects for program improvement.

A. Nicholson inquired if ICS budgeted for this. B. Fauske responded that ICS did not budget for sequestration and has already leaned up the staffing. A. Nicholson questioned if ICS had any reserves. R. Strong replied that BCHA holds the program reserves. B. Fauske responded that ICS has some of its own reserves but not enough for additional staffing.

A. Nicholson inquired if ICS would be able to administer the program through the end of the year without using the BCHA's reserves funds. B. Fauske answered that without the reserves funds, ICS will continue to suspend leasing up new vouchers and continue working understaffed. R. Hallet added that this would affect the whole community. She mentioned that she is a member of the Brown County Housing and Homeless Coalition, which monthly discusses the concerns caused by not issuing additional vouchers. Not leasing up more vouchers affects homeless shelters and transitional housing programs because they are not able to move people in and out. A. Nicholson expressed that homeless reports from the Protection and Welfare Committee show that the majority of homeless people are from outside of Brown County, which is a concern. He's not going to support this.

A. Hartman asked for clarification that ICS wants to hire two more people and issue 150 more vouchers, for which funding would come from reserves. The hope is then that HUD will then provide additional funding the following year to continue to support these additional vouchers, but if they don't, would we have to continue to use reserves? B. Fauske responded that there is turnover within the program, but the reserves funds will have to be

utilized if there is no additional funding available. P. Leifker reported that about 30 people are terminated from the program each month, and those vouchers are not being offered to other families currently. M. Roberts expanded on this explaining that when new vouchers are issued, they call in extra families because they know there is a percentage that are not successful in leasing up.

- R. Hallet clarified that if BCHA was not to receive funding for the following year, HUD will help and guide the Housing Authority with other strategies before terminating families from the program, which would be the last resort.
- R. Strong also explained that if there were to be no additional funding available, then the BCHA/ICS may need to cut back on administration. A. Hartman asked if that means that new staff hired would lose their job later. R. Strong responded not necessarily because those are the positions that are needed to keep the program going; ICS would have to find other areas that could be cut. He mentioned that the first budget draft should be presented in October.
- A. Nicholson inquired about why ICS did not fill its vacant staff positions earlier. B. Fauske replied it's because of sequestration; they wanted to be safe due to cuts, so they decided to suspend everything and acted very conservatively. A. Nicholson again inquired if ICS could get through the year without filling the positions. B. Fauske responded yes, but if there is a need in the community, and we are sitting on seven to eight times the recommended savings, the community is going to look at BCHA/ICS very poorly if we choose to do nothing.
- A. Nicholson stated that BCHA should focus on the needs of the people of Brown County compared to those coming from outside the area. He expressed his opinion that the results of the survey show that we are catering to people from outside of our community. To him, residing here one to five years is not a Brown County resident. He stated in his view, about half and half of those who are applying are Brown County residents, in his definition of residents. To him, this is not a need. He feels that the residents would stay and the others would leave and take their vouchers with them. B. Fauske reminded him that historically, 9% are porting out; 91% are staying.
- T. Diedrick shared his explanation of this situation in a different scenario. He explained that like many non-profit organizations, they (at Options for Independent Living) have an endowment fund that is used for unmet needs. They have found that donors want to see organizations use their endowment funds. Therefore, Options is using part of the endowment every year to make it work for the people. He sees this as the same situation, that the reserves need to be used in order to secure more funding for the future. In his opinion, we don't have a choice but to use the reserves.
- A. Nicholson expressed that he disagrees and that BCHA is serving non-residents who moved to Brown County for an unknown reason. R. Hallet clarified that the reason cited on the survey for coming to Brown County is to be with friends and family.
- B. Fauske inquired about the strategy for the utilization of the Housing Assistance Payments and Administrative reserves funds. A. Nicholson replied that vouchers should be given to other communities in need; we don't have to spend the reserves.
- B. Fauske asked what BCHA would do with the 600 people on the waiting list. A. Nicholson responded that the majority of the wait list applicants are non-Brown County residents (according to his definition of residents). He added that the Protection and Welfare Committee has proven that more than 50% of the homeless population is from outside of

Brown County. BCHA should assist the residents of Brown County instead of leasing up new vouchers to non-Brown County clients.

B. Fauske questioned what will happen to Brown County residents on the waiting list without leasing up new vouchers. A. Nicholson replied that waiting an additional 6 months is not a long wait. R. Hallet clarified that most of them have been waiting at least a year already.

A. Hartman stated that she does not like what St. John's Homeless Shelter has done to her neighborhood, and she is not interested in assisting drunkards. She inquired how clients at the homeless shelters who are alcoholics are handled. R. Hallet responded that a client who is disruptive or has a criminal background due to their drinking would not qualify for a voucher. P. Leifker stated that they take a lot of referrals from Freedom House and other community shelters, but the numbers from St. John's is very low, likely because they don't qualify. A. Hartman stated her neighbors are not against helping people, but they don't want to be assisting people who are coming here from other areas because they can get better welfare benefits here.

A. Hartman questioned if the applicants who will be served first are veterans, people who've been here for a long time, longer than 5 years. P. Leifker explained the preference categories' order of first displaced individuals, then, elderly or disabled, and veterans. R. Hallet also added that there are some victims of the apartment complex fire in Allouez at the top of the waiting list, but we've been unable to help them because we are not currently issuing vouchers.

A. Hartman inquired if a victim from the fire who has been a Brown County resident for only 6 months would still qualify for the voucher program. R. Hallet responded that the victim will qualify because the client is considered a displaced Brown County resident, regardless of how long they've lived here.

P. Leifker said he just verified that the actual number on the waiting list is 753. A. Hartman asked if only 150 of them will be assisted. P. Leifker explained that vouchers will continue to be issued until we reach the goal of 3,150. Thereafter, each month as approximately 30 families drop off the program, ICS will take 30-50 applicants off the waiting list to make up for those lost by natural attrition. They will continue to serve the highest preferences first.

A. Hartman questioned the qualifications for the clients from the Freedom House. P. Leifker responded that Freedom House clients would have to provide verification that they are homeless and receiving case management, then they would qualify for the preference after those who are displaced. He clarified that elderly, disabled, veterans, and homeless (with children and receiving case management) all fall within one preference category.

A. Hartman inquired about the percentage of this category compared to the entire waiting list. M. Roberts said that is information they have but did not bring with them, but could provide it by email. A. Hartman clarified the preference categories.

T. Diedrick asked for a motion to determine if we want to use the reserve funding. A. Nicholson made a motion to deny. T. Diedrick called for a second to that motion. Being none, he asked if there was a motion to approve use of the reserve funding.

A. Hartman questioned if BCHA decides to use the reserves funds for this year, will they be able to review it for change in the future. P. Leifker stated that staff has monthly conference calls with HUD in which they will continue to review the forecasting tool to see where the numbers are at. So, this is something that we will continue to follow closely.

A. Nicholson stated that basically if we don't use the reserves, then there might not be a need for the vouchers next year. He asked A. Hartman if she wants more vouchers next year, in a higher percentage in her neighborhood, as this is a possibility.

A. Hartman inquired about how many vouchers ICS has as a total. P. Leifker responded there are 3,380 vouchers total. M. Roberts clarified that we are unable to administer all of these because of the Housing Assistance Payments funding. A. Hartman confirmed that about 3,150 is the number that we think we can use, so what happens with the rest that we can't use. P. Leifker stated they are unfunded. A. Hartman asked R. Hallet if we've never been able to use them. R. Hallet stated previously the funding was at 100%. T. Diedrick stated that years ago we had been able to use all vouchers.

T. Diedrick stated that port-outs are a new issue in the past 5 years; A. Nicholson added that it has been increasing because other housing authorities have closed their waiting lists while ours is still open.

A. Hartman asked for confirmation that the 150 vouchers that would be added would be the applicants who already live here and are on the waiting list, and it wouldn't be new people coming from outside of the area. P. Leifker responded that the applicants who are currently near the top of the waiting list have been on the list for six months to a year. Once the category of displaced, elderly/disabled, and veterans (and homeless with children who have case management) have been depleted, then the next category would be families with minors and those have been on the waiting list for at least a year. R. Hallet reported that aside from those at the top due to displacement, there is a group of approximately 70 families which ICS had invited to come in to receive a voucher, but then with the funding cuts, the vouchers could not be issued. These families would be the clients on top of the waiting list after the displaced applicants.

A. Hartman expressed her concern about what the federal government is doing, but that she doesn't want to see them take away the reserves. A. Nicholson said this could happen, but it isn't for sure. R. Hallet added that this situation occurred with the Green Bay Housing Authority; they did not receive their operating subsidy, and they had to resort to use their reserves.

A. Nicholson stated that ICS should utilize its budget for the rest of this year, and then we'll figure out what is needed for next year. R. Strong clarified that under the current contract, BCHA does not approve ICS' budget; rather BCHA provides ICS with 96.4% of all the Administrative funds. We all make our best guess of what the total of this would be, but that total got cut, so ICS got 96.4% of a smaller number. So the overall amount ICS thought they would get was cut. A. Nicholson stated that ICS has said they can get through this year; we should find out what they need for next year.

R. Strong stated that ICS would be holding at about 3,000 units. P. Leifker stated this isn't accurate because there would be the natural attrition, so they would lose about 200 participants by the end of the year, so it would decrease to about 2,800. Then we'd need about 350 to get us to the goal of 3,150 vouchers. P. Leifker reiterated that to increase by 350 isn't as simple as bringing in 350 clients and hoping they'll all lease-up; it's a much longer process that would take months to lease-up this many clients. B. Fauske also restated the concern that BCHA will have to answer to the fact that HUD recommended we issue more vouchers now, but we said no despite the community's issue of homelessness. B. Fauske urged the commissioners to think about these issues in making this decision.

- R. Hallet stated that she understands A. Nicholson's concern that people outside of Brown County are coming here to take advantage of our services. A. Nicholson expressed that is the issue that is dividing this Authority.
- B. Fauske expressed that the honest people shouldn't be the ones to suffer because of this. The challenging part is that ICS will have to look at the people displaced by the Allouez fire and tell them they can't help them. A. Nicholson offered to help do this, on behalf of the Authority.
- B. Fauske restated that HUD's recommendation is not to continue to sit on our reserves. A. Nicholson expressed that HUD has no concern for Green Bay or Brown County; they could care less about us, whereas he does care. We can get through this year and then look at next year's budget and help out with what we have to from the reserves at that time.
- A. Hartman stated that until that time, there are people from the fire that we technically have the money to help. She has no problem helping people from the fire or people who are veterans, but she would like to know how many are in each category. She doesn't want to help the bums, but she doesn't want to hurt the good guys.
- R. Strong expressed that he is interested in helping the victims of the fire. He suggested BCHA could authorize 20 vouchers for those people. Then as a second step, have the breakdown of the rest of the waiting list at the next meeting. The chances of getting families from outside of town coming to just port-out becomes smaller when we have a better understanding of the numbers. He reiterated that every month that goes by, it will shrink the program; that is a consequence of doing nothing. HUD will look at our performance, which will be around 2,900 units, and that is how many units they will fund us for again next year with a possibility of another reduction in administrative costs.
- A. Hartman inquired how many units were damaged in the apartment fire. Various people replied that there were 74 units within the apartment complex, but not all clients will qualify.
- A. Nicholson suggested that this authorization be postponed until the next meeting when BCHA has more information about how many vouchers they will need to approve of.
- T. Diedrick suggested we could help those specifically displaced by the fire who are eligible. A. Hartman stated she could support helping those displaced by the fire.

Discussion continued regarding how many displaced by the fire might be eligible and how many vouchers should be authorized. T. Diedrick suggested that BCHA authorize 20 vouchers to assist those who have been displaced by the fire. R. Strong added that if BCHA finds that more than 20 vouchers are needed, then a decision will be made again for the next meeting.

- R. Hallet questioned what should be done if they find there are individuals who are on the waiting list that has been displaced for a different reason. R. Strong suggested that the vouchers could be available all residents who have been displaced.
- A. Hartman indicated she would support helping up to 20 displacees. Furthermore, she would like to know if we authorized issuing another 150 the amount that would come from the various preference categories.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by A. Nicholson to authorize the use of reserve funds to issue a maximum of 20 vouchers to assist those who have been displaced, primarily those from the Allouez fire and, further, to provide a breakdown of the waiting list for next month. Motion carried.

- R. Strong reiterated that the 20 vouchers will go to displaced victims who are Brown County residents and that the applicants in the other top preferences are probably long-term residents of Brown County, so this is addressing what we want to do.
- M. Roberts stated that ICS will provide the Commissioners with the data showing the numbers of how many people are in the different preference categories. He can email this within a few days. He explained these numbers are run monthly, so at the July meeting he will provide what the numbers are at that time as well so they can see the comparison. He mentioned that there are over 100 applicants on the waiting list who fall into the elderly/disabled/veteran category, but he doesn't know the exact number. He clarified that to get to the goal of 3,150 vouchers, the majority if not all would be coming from that category.
- 5. Approval to renew agreement with Catholic Charities for reimbursement of pre- and posthomeownership counseling for Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers
  - R. Hallet stated that previously NeighborWorks Green Bay was the only agency that provided homeownership counseling for the Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers, but Catholic Charities wanted the opportunity as well. In 2010, BCHA offered this contract to Catholic Charities, which was renewed the subsequent years, and they are looking to renew the contract again for this year.

A. Nicholson asked who will pay, how much, and how many clients. R. Hallet responded that BCHA will pay Catholic Charities \$500 per client and that the previous two years there were no such clients.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of renewing the contract agreement with Catholic Charities for reimbursement of pre- and post-homeownership counseling for Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers.

A. Nicholson inquired how long the program has been around. R. Hallet replied that the Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership program has existed in Brown County since 2001. A. Nicholson asked for clarification if any were involved last year. Is this program warranted if there is no one participating in it? R. Hallet responded that Catholic Charities had no participants last year but would like the opportunity to participate when there are new clients in the future.

A. Hartman questioned if the homebuyers have been satisfied with the counseling that Catholic Charities provided, if it was any different than NeighborWorks' counseling. R. Hallet answered that BCHA requires certain criteria for the counseling, for which Catholic Charities submitted an outline showing that they meet the criteria of what is required. R. Strong added that both Catholic Charities and NeighborWorks were trained by the same entity.

A. Nicholson inquired if this is a duplication of services and if the program is warranted. R. Hallet responded that the program is based on the housing market, and currently it is difficult for low-income families to receive a loan so there aren't as many families going through the Homeownership Program.

A. Nicholson asked if they don't utilize the money, would it come back to the BCHA. R. Hallet replied that it is not paid until clients have received the counseling. Catholic Charities would bill us when they have a client.

R. Strong stated that this was only for the Homeownership Program through the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Clients will have to be certified and then be able to purchase a home.

All agreed to the motion. Motion carried.

- 6. Review and approval of revision to Chapter 11 (Reexaminations) of the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan
  - P. Leifker stated that if a family reports zero income, the Public Housing Authority (PHA) will conduct an interim reexamination. ICS is proposing to change these reexaminations from every 3 months to every 6 months as long as the family continues to report zero income. He explained that if a client has zero income, ICS brings them in for an interview to discuss how they are paying their bills and if there have been any changes in income. This is a procedure to check for updates on the client's income status. As an agency, ICS has determined that as a cost savings measure, it would be more beneficial to do these reviews every 6 months instead of quarterly. There are less than 200 such clients, and they generally report very minimal changes to their income. Such changes may result in only a dollar or two difference in the HAP, but to achieve that there is considerably more invested in postage, staff time, etc. P. Leifker stated that HUD requires these individuals to be met with on an annual basis.

A. Nicholson inquired about the purpose of having these reexaminations for every 6 months instead of every 3. P. Leifker reiterated that this change is a cost-efficiency measure in that the changes to the rent are not substantial enough to warrant it.

T. Diedrick pointed out that if ICS suspects a change, they still have a right to follow-up.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of the revision to Chapter 11 (Reexaminations) of the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan. Motion carried.

R. Hallet pointed out that the agenda says "revisions", but this was an error as there is only one chapter to be revised.

### **INFORMATIONAL:**

- 7. Review of BCHA investments
  - S. Schmutzer stated that the BCHA is enrolled in the CEDARS program. She explained that an entity can only be insured for up to \$250,000 FDRC insurance, so CEDARS is a program that goes out to multiple banks to invest the money so BCHA does not have to go to multiple banks itself to ensure it stays insured. It's all in one spot, and they invest it to cover for the insurance. Nicolet Bank, where we have the CEDARS account, has a set rate of 0.3% which is a rate that is based off of the money market rate. This program is all 100% insured through all the various banks that they use, and they believe that the 0.3% will hold steady for the foreseeable future. She also contacted Harris Bank to find what their rate is and found that it is at 0.15%. So, while the 0.3% seems low, it's in line with other rates.

### 8. Status of Housing Intern

R. Hallet stated that the current intern Mackenzie Reed has graduated from University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, and she has been successfully hired by ICS. She explained that this leaves the Housing Intern position vacant, but the GBHA has an intern who is currently taking on M. Reed's duties. University of Wisconsin-Green Bay has been contacted to recruit a new intern for the fall semester.

### **BILLS:**

S. Schmutzer reported that there was an error on the last bill for the City of Green Bay. She explained that she voided the bill, it shows up twice, but it has only been paid once.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by A. Nicholson to approve the bills. Motion carried.

#### FINANCIAL REPORT:

S. Schmutzer stated that she is working on entering data into the Quickbooks software from when the accountant position was vacant, so she does not yet have a financial report because the numbers would be skewed until all the data is entered.

### STAFF REPORT:

None

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Kv:rah:ejns

### PROCEEDINGS OF THE AGING & DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER EXECUTIVE/ FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING June 27, 2013

**PRESENT:** Tom Diedrick, Pat Hickey, Barbara Robinson, Donajane Brasch

**ABSENT:** Keith Pamperin

ALSO PRESENT: Devon Christianson, Arlene Westphal, Debra Bowers, Laurie Ropson,

Diana Brown, Denise Misovec

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Diedrick at 8:37 a.m.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA:** Ms. Brasch/Ms. Hickey moved to adopt the agenda. **MOTION CARRIED.** 

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MEETING OF MAY 24, 2012:

Ms. Brasch/Ms. Hickey moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of May 24, 2012, **MOTION CARRIED.** 

### **FINANCE 101 EDUCATIONAL SESSION:**

A. OVERVIEW OF REVENUE STREAMS AND ALLOCATIONS: Ms. Christianson began the Finance 101 Educational Session by explaining that the ADRC of Brown County has five major funding streams from which the ACDRC receives revenue. They are the Older Americans Act (OAA), ADRC State/Federal funds, 85.21 State Transportation, County Levy, and private donations. She noted that the handouts in the board packet for agenda item 4-A are the detail and talking points for each of the Title Programs she would be discussing. Each of these funding streams requires funds to be spent according to policy. Funds are distributed to local aging units/ADRCs from Federal, State, and local sources. The challenge for the ADRC is to meet all funding source requirements without receiving adequate funding levels. Most funding sources are not able to be combined; but, the ADRC balances program needs and funding sources as creatively and effectively as possible. The percent of funds in the ADRCs total budget are as follows: OAA 19%, ADRC 48%, State Transportation 10%, Brown County 16%, and donations 7%. All OAA Funds are donation based. Ms. Christianson reviewed the detail of the OAA Funding Stream, each of its funding sources, Title Programs, how we structure where these sources are allocated, and the reporting requirements.

The next funding stream discussed was the ADRC. Ms. Christianson explained that there are really two main arms to our ADRC Funding: Information & Assistance & Options Counseling and DBS. Prevention is a core service; however, is not funded. We may not charge a fee for any of our ADRC Services and we may not fundraise for these programs. ADRCs are required to draw down 28% of all of our revenues from Medical Assistance Administrative Claiming (MA Claiming) requiring each of our staff in these areas to categorize and report everything they do every 15 minutes of their work day. The better we are at MA Claiming the more resources we can draw down. The ADRC allocation, in addition to MA Revenue captured represents our largest growth in the past six years.

The third funding stream reviewed was the 85.21 State Transportation Grant. The ADRC must match 20% of those funds with County Levy. She explained that the 85.21 State Transportation dollars are used to contract with Oneida, Red Cross, the ADRC Rural Driver Escort Program, N.E.W. Curative, the Salvation Army, and Human Services. Our Rural Driver Escort Program serves our rural areas with volunteer drivers providing rides to employment, physicians, the pharmacy, nutrition, and our of County medical services such as Marshfield and Madison.

The fourth funding stream comes from the Brown County General Property Tax Levy which has been reduced each year. We are required to return about 50% of our levy to the County in chargebacks which include administrative charges, IT, Corp. Council, the use of our building, and health insurance administration for our staff. Another \$100,000 goes to match the 85.21 State Transportation Grant and close to \$151,000 goes to Day Care services through NEW Curative.

The fifth funding stream is private donations and program fees. Some donations are restricted and some are not. An example of a restricted donation is the one we received from a private individual who wanted their donation to support outreach in our rural areas. This restricted donation was not connected to any of the other funding streams so we were able to use it to employ Jeremy Slusarek as a Rural Outreach Coordinator. This is a two year position and will help us increase participation at the Denmark Senior Center and the Nutrition Programs meeting the intention of the donation.

In summary, Ms. Christianson noted that as we move towards a new budget we need to look at all of these funding streams to see how we did last year, how are we doing this year, and what do we need to plan for.

**B. REVIEW OF LOGOS MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT:** Ms. Bowers directed those present to the May, 2013 ADRC Summary Financial Report marked agenda item 4-B that was included in the packet. She began her review of the financial report by identifying the revenue sources received by the ADRC and how to read the monthly Logos financial reports relative to those incoming funds. She pointed out each funding source that was reviewed in Ms. Christianson's report and how they can be read on this monthly report. These revenues are identified as grants; however they do not function as traditional grants. They are allocations or a contract for services based on demographics in a community, needs, and population. There are reporting requirements for each funding source received. When constructing the budget Ms. Bowers considers several things: revenue projections, operating costs, prior year experience, and current year averages.

Referencing the monthly financial report, Mr. Epstein inquired about the 153% used/rec'd and \$2000 deficit under 4301 SHIP Federal Grant State Health. Ms. Bowers explained that in revenues () means we received more than we budgeted. In this case, we were able to capture an extra \$2,000 in revenue. Other funding sources are received in 1 or 2 large payments during the year to the "year to date percentage received/used" must often be explained individually. Ms. Bowers uses the "Financial Highlights" documents each month at the ADRC Board Meeting to explain any major variances to keep the Board informed.

Ms. Bowers explained that some funding sources, like COP Waiver Meals, are variable as we receive funds only for individuals who are on that program and Brown County HSD has put these in their case plan. Consumers move, discontinue or start meals at a variable rate.

Ms. Bowers reviewed these additional revenues listed on the Financial Report:

- Charges and Fees and their origins: classes, day trips, a subscription for the newsletter, Driver Escort, or an In-Home Worker.
- Sales and Miscellaneous are miscellaneous items include the sale of Candy Bar sales and vending machine items.
- The Parking Revenue is generated from staff paid parking at 331
- Donations include nutrition donations and matching contributions from housing units where there is a meal site. These donations also have to be reinvested in nutrition programs.
- In-kind Services converts volunteer hours of service into an actual wage and used to match grant programs that allow it.

Ms. Bowers reviewed expenses. The highlights included:

Salary & Fringe which is a significant portion of our budget-for many programs "staff" are our service.

- Operating Costs include our Supplies, Maintenance Agreement for software and required reporting, Repairs and Maintenance of Equipment, Marketing, and Rental which is the rent for our nutrition sites at De Pere, Denmark & Pulaski.
- Volunteer Expense is for the recognition of our volunteers and Volunteer Expense Mileage is mileage reimbursement for our Homebound Meal Drivers
- Community Service Incentive is for John's program where he purchases food cards as incentives for his workers.

Ms. Bowers reviewed County Levy Targets and chargebacks. The ADRC receives and annual Levy Target that is used to support all of our programs. This Target Allocation includes charges that must be paid in return to the County. They include:

- Indirect Costs which are allocated to each department based on the number of staff and the direct costs of doing business based on actual information.
- Information Services charges are for our IT support, Server space, Help Desk, Hardware and limited software support.
- Insurance costs that are part of our liability coverage and workmen's compensation.
- Facilities charges for County maintenance and service orders for our 300 S. Adams building.

Ms. Bowers reviewed Contracted Services and the expenses incurred monthly on the Financial Report. Each contract is listed with current expenses. Ms. Bowers moved on to Administrative Fees related to auditing and finally Contributions.

Ms. Bowers concluded by indicating that we have a balanced budget illustrating that our revenues match our expense totals.

### PRELIMINARY BUDGET REVIEW AND APPROVAL:

A. POSITION ADDITIONS AND INITIATIVES: The first position that we are interested in adding is an Administrative Specialist who would act as a bridge between our Support Team and the front desk. We are entertaining the possibility of starting a membership where folks could become a member of the AddLIFE Center for a fee and receive incentives, in return, such as reduced costs for classes or marketing items like a coffee mug. It has become difficult for our front desk to manage the increase in registrations and phone calls. We have implemented a registration phone line that is answered by our Support Team Members to reduce the pressure at the front desk. We hope to purchase software products allowing us to implement registration, bill pay and credit cards online. The Administrative Specialist would benefit all units within our agency. Ms. Christianson included a job description and requested approval for this position to move forward.

The second request is in regards to the Benefit Specialist Assistant. This position requires State approval as it is outside regular core services. This position would draw high levels of Medicaid Funds. The State requires ADRCs to prioritize DBS Services. This position would not require a 4-year degree allowing it to support both Elderly Benefit Specialists (EBS) and Disability Benefit Specialists (DBS). Folks who come into our agency aren't discriminatory, they just have a need. This position would be able to prescreen consumers who come in, help them with initial applications, like for energy assistance and other things that are basic benefits, and refer them into the benefit unit for detailed support and advocacy. A call center model is being planned within the unit to alleviate front desk call routing and to support the flow of work once this position is added.

The final addition presented for consideration is increasing the Resource Database Specialist Position to full time. This current .5 position maintains all of our 1800 programs listed in the web based community resource database housed on our website. Should this position be

increased, efforts to develop relationships with all of the providers and educating them on new initiatives and regulations could occur. This position would also coordinate outreach events, booths, and presentations that would increase our visibility and communication within the provider community. These increased responsibilities would also include creating our electronic provider newsletter, and written materials for consumers and families.

B. DRAFT BUDGET: Ms. Christianson referred committee members to the two handouts for agenda item 5-B, the Preliminary 2014 Budget, included in the committee packet. She explained that there are many unknowns: sequestration, brown county levy target, health insurance premiums, transportation allocation. The budget was constructed considering several of these unknowns and contains conservative estimates to try and anticipate some of the possible reductions. Ms. Christianson has been corresponding with The Office of Resource Center Development (ORCD) to explore the funding opportunity with a Nursing Home Relocation Specialist position and the potential to receive additional state/federal matching funds to make it sum sufficient. In addition, the historical roll out of the Brown County ADRC was different than all other ADRC's. ORCD is exploring if Brown County could receive the full ADRC allocation prior to Family Care's expansion as other ADRC's have. They will let us know. The request to fill the Nursing Home Relocation Specialist position is currently with the County Executive for consideration in 2013. This position has the potential of generating additional Medicaid Administrative funds. Ms. Christianson is asking the Finance & Executive Committee for support to move forward with this position this year.

Ms. Christianson noted that she did put in the 2% increase for staff but the final decision to add this will be made by the County Executive during the budget process. The handout for item 5-B outlines the costs of the position additions and changes. The total additions would put the ADRC \$24,000 over budget. Suggested changes were recommended that could balance the budget: \$14,000 in new staff cost could be covered through net assets as a one-time expense, \$10,000 ear marked in restricted donations to supplement the rural outreach position as this will be funded for only 1 more year. These changes would bring our budget in line. We also hope to create a membership program and room rental fees to generate additional revenue. These changes, additional revenue and potential additional ADRC expansion funding being explored will help balance this conservative budget. We will be getting our County Levy on July 1<sup>st</sup>. We have talked as a staff about Plan B and the management team is prepared to decide which positions we would not fill should we not have the resources. The full ADRC board will have a more complete picture.

Ms. Brown, N.E.W. Curative, gave a brief presentation on their request. Curative did submit a 0% increase. Ms. Brown explained they increased our Older Americans requests \$3,000, reduced the nutrition request \$3,000 and increased the transportation request around 6,000. This year they anticipate giving away about \$88,000 in adjusted fees. Ms. Brown stated if there were any extra funds they would apply it to reduced fees. Ms. Brown has submitted information on areas they would eliminate should their allocation be reduced.

Ms. Brasch/Ms. Hickey moved to approve the Draft Budget. MOTION CARRIED.

SUCH OTHER MATTERS AS ARE ALLOWED BY LAW: None

**ANNOUNCEMENTS: None** 

**ADJOURN:** Ms. Hickey/Ms. Brasch moved to adjourn the meeting. **MOTION CARRIED.** The meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Arlene Westphal, Secretary